IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND NORTHERN DIVISION

- - - - - - - X

:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

:

: Criminal No. 03-0088-WDQ

ANTHONY J. MARCANTONI,

v.

: Baltimore, Maryland

Defendant.

---- January 18, 2013

HEARING

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM D. QUARLES, Judge

APPEARANCES: DEBORAH JOHNSTON, Esq.

Office of the United States Attorney

36 S. Charles St., 4th Fl.

Baltimore, MD 21201

On Behalf of the Government

HOWARD L. CARDIN, Esq. STEVEN LEVINE, Esq. Cardin and Gitomer, P.A. 211 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202

On Behalf of the Defendant

ALSO PRESENT: JOHN ALBERT, Probation Officer

On Behalf of Department of Parole

and Probation

Audio Operator: Katina Tyson

Transcription Company: CompuScribe

5100 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 101

Lanham, MD. 20706 (301) 577-5882

Proceedings recorded by electric sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

\underline{I} \underline{N} \underline{D} \underline{E} \underline{X}

		<u>Page</u>
Preliminary Matters		2
Court Qualifies Defendant		5
Statement of Facts by Deborah Johnson, Esq. Attorney for the Government		7
Ruling by Judge Quarles		9
Government's Disposition		9
Comments by Howard Cardin, Esq. Attorney for the Defendant		15
Comments by Steven Levine, Esq. Attorney for the Defendant		21
Sentencing by Judge Quarles		24
EXHIBITS:	FOR IDENTIFICATION	IN EVIDENCE

EXHIBITS: FOR IDENTIFICATION IN EVIDENCE

For the Government:

1 8 8

Keynote: "---" indicates inaudible in transcript.

3 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: Good afternoon please be seated. (Chorus of "Good afternoon, Your Honor.") 3 MS. JOHNSON: Good afternoon, we are here in the 4 matter of the United States of America versus Anthony J. 5 Marcantoni, case number AMD-03-0088. I am Deborah Johnson 6 representing the Government. Seated with me at counsel table is 7 Probation Officer John Allen. 8 9 THE COURT: Ms. Johnson, Mr. Albert, good afternoon. 10 MR. ALBERT: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 11 MR. CARDIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Howard 12 Cardin, Steven Levine representing Mr. Marcantoni. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Cardin, Mr. Levine, Mr. Marcantoni. 14 How are we proceeding counsel? 15 MR. CARDIN: Your Honor, frankly I think I am reading the notice of violation for the first time. Obviously 16 my client was convicted through the United States District 17 Court for the District of Maryland before His Honor Judge Titus 18 and I assume that that is the grounds for the violation. 19 MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I believe there are 20 21 multiple ground for the violation. And the most recent 22 petition was filed on June 15, 2011. I think it was a sealed 23 document at that time, Document 82 in the record. We are -- if the defendant acknowledges and admits his violation based on 24

that conviction, we will move to dismiss the other grounds

23

24

```
which include failing to file written reports and filing
 2
    reports that contain false information.
 3
              THE COURT: You are proceeding on the -- which dated
    one?
 4
 5
              MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, it is document 82, filed
    on June 15, 2011.
 6
7
              THE COURT: Okay.
              MR. CARDIN: Again, Your Honor, we are obviously
 8
9
    prepared to admit the conviction before Judge Titus, in this
    Court only in the southern district.
10
11
              THE COURT: The June 15 does not have the conviction
12
    but I assume --- be willing to admit the statutory conviction
13
    which will not illegally possess a controlled substance and
    clearly the conviction means that he violated that statutory
14
15
    condition. That would be the second whereas on the carryover
    sheet of the June 15, 2011 --
16
17
              MS. JOHNSON: As well as the first one, Your Honor,
    which is shall not commit any federal, state or local crime.
18
19
              THE COURT: Yes.
20
              MR. CARDIN: Yes.
              MS. JOHNSON: I think at the third one as well as
21
22
    admitted with our -- with his quilty plea, the first three are
```

THE COURT: Okay, well, I don't have the plea in front of me. I do have the conviction and the conviction

admitted and it would be the last three that are not.

1nc

5

```
establishes --- any agreed upon disposition folks?
              MS. JOHNSON: No, Your Honor. There is no agreed on
 2
 3
    disposition.
              MR. CARDIN: We would like to but no, Your Honor, we
 4
    have not agreed on disposition.
 5
              THE COURT: Usually you all work those out.
 6
7
              MR. CARDIN: We seem to think there should have
    been, but no there is no agreed disposition.
8
 9
              THE COURT: Okay. Madam Clerk will you please
10
    swear Mr. Marcantoni.
11
               (Whereupon, the defendant was sworn in.)
12
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
13
              THE CLERK: Thank you. Please state your full name
    for the record.
14
15
              THE DEFENDANT: Anthony Joseph Marcantoni.
16
              THE CLERK: Thank you. What is your age?
17
              THE DEFENDANT: 32.
18
              THE CLERK: And what year were you born?
19
              THE DEFENDANT: 1980.
20
              THE CLERK: Thank you.
21
              THE COURT: All right, Mr. Marcantoni, how far did
22
    you go in school?
23
              THE DEFENDANT: 52 credits of college.
24
              THE COURT: Can you read, write and understand the
    English language?
```

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Can you understand as it is being spoken this afternoon?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that you are admitting two violations of supervised release? What is the -- what is the -- what grade is the -- the shall not commit any federal, state or local crime?

MR. CARDIN: Your Honor, violation is Grade A.

THE COURT: Okay, thanks. Anyway, Mr. Marcantoni, you understand that you are admitting a Grade A violation of supervised release. This violation would expose you to a guidelines range of imprisonment of 12 to 18 months. You don't have to admit the violation. You can require the Government to prove the violation at a hearing where they would through witnesses and documents, attempt to prove by preponderance of the evidence that you did in fact violate these conditions of supervised release.

At that hearing, you will also have a right to be represented by counsel. You will have the right to put on your own evidence, call your own witnesses as well as of course, cross examine the Government's witnesses and object to the evidence.

And of course, if you needed additional time to prepare for that hearing, I would give you a reasonable

23

24

```
postponement for that. Do you understand the rights that you
 2
    are giving up, sir?
 3
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: And are you willing to proceed with --
 4
    by waiving those rights?
 5
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Thank you. Please have a seat.
    Government's evidence? Proffer?
8
 9
              MS. JOHNSON: Yes, Your Honor. If that -- we would
    present to the Court a copy of his signed guilty plea that was
10
11
    entered in the Court in case number 10-000777-RWT, it was
12
    signed and executed by him on September 11, 2012.
13
    particular, in the statement of facts, the defendant admitted
14
    that between 2008 and at least at or about January 2011, he
15
    knowingly conspired to distribute and possess with intent to
    distribute 100 kilograms or more of marijuana. And he
16
    acknowledged who his co-conspirators were.
17
18
              He acknowledged in the signed statement of facts
    that he served as a dealer and a distributor in the marijuana
19
20
    conspiracy and that he received shipments that ranged from 50
21
    to 250 pounds and those shipments occurred sometimes as often
22
    as twice per month.
```

That he -- that the co-conspirators collected money from him on more than 10 occasions, collecting more than \$100,000 from him on multiple different occasions. And I would lnc |

```
submit this as Government's Exhibit 1 for the record.
 2
              THE COURT: Government 1 is admitted.
                                   (The document referred to was
 3
                                   marked for identification as
 4
                                   Government's Exhibit 1 and was
 5
                                   received in evidence.)
 6
 7
              THE COURT: May I see it please? Thank you.
              MR. CARDIN: May I make one comment, Your Honor?
 8
 9
              THE COURT:
                          Yes, sir?
10
              MR. CARDIN: Thank you. We did proceed rather
11
    rapidly and perhaps the allegations in count 1 and 2 should
12
    have reflected 100 kilograms rather than 1,000 kilograms.
13
    Because I think the numbers were changed when we did execute
14
    the plea agreement.
15
              MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I don't think that -- I
    don't know that that affects the -- his admission but he is
16
    admitting that he violated any federal, state or local law. As
17
18
    part of plea negotiations in this case, we allowed Mr.
    Marcantoni to -- we negotiated a plea and allowed him to plead
19
20
    to the 100 kilograms or more with a mandatory 10 years instead
21
    of a mandatory 20 years that came with the 1,000 kilograms or
22
    more.
23
              THE COURT:
                          Well, the finding of the JNC of course
    would be just the violation of the statutory condition, did not
24
    or shall not commit any federal, state or local crime, do not
```

```
illegally possess a controlled substance so there will not be a
 2
    quantity in the finding or the judgement of commitment order.
 3
              MR. CARDIN: Right. Thank you.
              THE COURT: Any other --- anything further? Any
 4
    deletions, additions or corrections?
 5
              MR. CARDIN: No, Your Honor.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Mr. Marcantoni, did you hear what Ms.
    Johnston told me?
8
 9
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.
10
              THE COURT: Did she tell me the truth?
11
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
12
              THE COURT: Are you admitting the violation of your
13
    own free will?
14
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am, Your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: Are you admitting the violation because
    you did in fact commit it?
16
17
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Good. Then I find that the Government
18
19
    has proffered facts sufficient to prove by a preponderance of
    the evidence that you violated statutory condition thall shall
20
21
    not commit any federal, state or local crime and the statutory
22
    condition that you should illegally possess a controlled
23
    substance. What is the Government's position on disposition?
24
              MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, the Government in this
   case is asking the Court to impose a term of imprisonment.
```

Consecutive to the sentence that he is now serving. I think it is important in this case, I know that Your Honor was not the Judge who sat over the original case nor was I the prosecutor involved in that original case that he is on supervised release for.

But back in 2003, he plead guilty I think on the eve of trial or on the morning of trial in that case as well, plead guilty to the distribution of 100 kilograms or more of marijuana. And that instances guideline range was I believe 70 months, was the bottom of that guideline range. And the Court at that time imposed a sentence below the guideline range, a sentence of 60 months.

The guideline range was actually 78 to 97 months.

Judge Davis gave him the benefit of believing that, I guess a term of 60 months would be adequate to assure that the purposes of sentencing were met and he was placed on that 60 month sentence.

He was placed on supervised release on that sentence on March 18, 2008. As is set forth in our statement of facts to the plea agreement which Mr. Marcantoni has --- as truthful, in 2008, he was back involved in marijuana, he was back selling marijuana. Counsel submitted to the Court a sentencing memo telling the Court what a great man he is and what wonderful contributions he is making to the community. Well, he was making his living selling marijuana.

He agreed in this statement of facts to that fact, to the fact that he was receiving loads of marijuana ranging from 50 to 250 pounds at a time. That he was paying for those. Co-conspirators were collecting money from him. Sometimes as much as \$100,000 at a time and one co-conspirator collected money from him on at least 10 different occasions.

He has consented to a \$500,000 forfeiture being entered against him in this case representing some of the proceeds he received as well as a Rolex watch. He was part of a business here, Your Honor. He and in fact, some of the leaders of this conspiracy are still fugitives but he received a Rolex watch as a reward for being such a good salesman for them here in Baltimore -- in Baltimore County, Maryland.

And he has agreed now to forfeit that watch as well as the \$500,000. But what it is particularly alarming to the Government is that this individual was put on probation in 2008 with Mr. Albert and shortly thereafter, was right back in this business, right back into selling drugs. In spite of the sentence he received and in spite of the 60 month sentence he served.

And with that, he is contacted by Mr. Albert because he has violated some -- not filing his reports as he should. They tried some intermediate actions with him and all of the while he is dealing with Mr. Albert, he is selling his marijuana. He is back there doing the same business. Mr.

Albert is trying to tell him that he is on the radar screen. You are not filing your reports, you are doing some other things. And he put in some temporary steps hoping to get Mr. Marcantoni on the right track.

But Mr. Marcantoni is out there selling marijuana, on a day in and day out basis making hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions of dollars selling marijuana here in Baltimore County, Baltimore Maryland. So in this instance, counsel asks the Court to just impose a concurrent sentence. Quideline state in Section 7(B)(1.3) that a term of imprisonment should be imposed that is consecutive to the sentence imposed even if that sentence is for the conviction as to the basis of the underlying violation.

A message has to be sent to Mr. Marcantoni but not only to Mr. Marcantoni but other people out in the community that if you violate supervised release, it doesn't just get washed into what you -- the basis for your violation. To give Mr. Marcantoni what he is asking for here which is the same 120 months sentence or a sentence concurrent with 120 month sentence that Judge Titus imposed. --- is to say that it doesn't matter that you violated supervised release, that it makes no difference because you are not getting any more of the sentence than Judge Titus imposed.

Judge Titus had to give him 120 months. So he gave him the low end of the guidelines which was 121 months.

Mr. Marcantoni didn't take supervised release serious. Mr. Albert was in contact with him throughout the time when he was on supervised release, throughout the time that he has admitted that he continued to sell marijuana. We are not talking about somebody who is selling a \$20 bag of marijuana here. Or a half a pound there.

We are talking about somebody who was getting 50 pounds, 100 pounds, 250 pounds in one shipment and then dispensing that and taking that money and living off of it and living off of it very well here in this community. So we are asking the Court to impose a sentence in this case consecutive to what Judge Titus has imposed.

And quite frankly it is the Government's position that given the scope of his violation, as I said, it is not somebody who was on probation for selling crack, who then goes out on the street corner and sells a couple of \$20 rocks of crack. This is someone who made the deliberate intention to I am back on supervised release, I am back in the business of selling marijuana.

And that is what he did. And he didn't care that he had to report to Mr. Albert. He didn't care that he was on supervised release. He felt comfortable that he could get away with it. And for that reason, we are asking the Court to impose the maximum that the Court can impose in this case. We think it is justified to go above the sentencing guidelines,

given the pervasive day in, day out violation, the scope of his criminal conduct while on supervised release and also note that under the guidelines as well, Section 71.4, provides for the Court to go over that guideline range where a defendant received a break on his initial sentence.

And then this initial sentence in this case, he in essence got a break from Judge Davis when Judge Davis didn't sentence him within the guideline range of 78 to 98 months, rather Judge David imposed the mandatory minimum sentence of 60 months. Which is what counsel is asking the Court to do in this case, don't give him any more time, just let him serve that 121 months because that is what he got from Judge Titus.

Given the fact that he had a benefit there and he didn't take advantage of it, he was put on notice with probation, he knew he was on supervised release and he went back into this business. And made hundreds of thousands of dollars, as I said if not millions. So we are asking the Court to impose a consecutive sentence of 36 months.

So at least now when maybe Mr. Marcantoni gets out, and has his 8 year supervised release in Judge Titus' case, perhaps now he will take supervised release seriously. I have to tell you, Your Honor, at the time he plead guilty, one of the things the questioned Judge Titus about is why did he have to have 8 years of supervised release after he served his 10 years sentence.

And I have the transcript if the Court wants to see that. So he was concerned that he should have to be put on supervised release after that. So we are asking the Court so that he will take his supervised release seriously the next time that the Court imposed the mandatory -- the maximum sentence consecutive to what he served.

THE COURT: Thank you. Defense?

MR. CARDIN: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, we would ask that both Mr. Levine and I have the opportunity to address the Court. On different matters, we will not repeat what we are saying. I have listened as I always would to what counsel has to say and one of the first things I noted was that Ms. Johnson indicated that she is not in the prosecutor who was at the original trial before Judge Davis.

Mr. Hamlin and most of my communications went back and forth with him because I had anticipated that he would be here. So, the fact that he is not, I suggested to this Court, leaves us in a position where there are a number of questions that might otherwise be answered which can't be because he is not here, although certainly available.

Let me say this, I was there. And contrary to what the Government represented, it was not on the eve of trial that Mr. Marcantoni plead guilty but in fact, it was probably about three weeks into trial, we were only sitting two days a week because Judge Davis had commitments, I think down at the Fourth

Circuit, but wherever it was, it was out of state. And the guilty plea was prompted by a comment by Judge Davis and then many meetings in the Court's chambers, when Judge Davis on the record said why are we in trial here?

And indicated that this case should be resolved and indicated at that time and there was also discussion on the record as to whether or not mandatory sentencing was appropriate in this case. So I don't want this Court to think that Judge Davis gave him a break because Judge Davis thought that the guidelines did not apply.

Judge Davis did not believe that the guidelines were appropriate in this case in the very beginning and he announced that in open court. Now, having said that, Mr. Marcantoni did enter a plea of guilty before Judge Davis. And we went through any number of things before the Judge in conversation because there were things that the Court wanted to know and the Court received the sentence.

Indeed, Mr. Marcantoni was placed on supervised release. That is obvious and required. Counsel remarks that Mr. Marcantoni questioned this supervised release. What Mr. Marcantoni questioned was the Government filing its 851 motion at the last minute, which had the effect of increasing the supervised release from four years to eight years.

And that was all part of the presentation that I made and I am about to make to this Court. That I believe and

I submit on behalf of Mr. Marcantoni that he has not been treated fairly since being released on supervised release. Or at least from the time that he began under the supervision of Mr. Albert. So let me explain.

Mr. Marcantoni has always been fair and honest with this Court. Whether it be before Your Honor, whether it be before Judge Davis, or before Judge Titus. And I will tell the Court that the issues that were raised and were litigated before Judge Titus, day after day in many respects, were issues that I still believe should have been exercised and should have been resolved by appellate courts I think.

There are many, many issues which we and I use we because we are the --- waived the in the plea agreement before Judge Titus. Actually an agreement was negotiated, you want to talk on the eve of trial, we didn't finish before Judge Titus on that Monday if I remember it being a Monday, probably about 3:00 or 3:30 in the afternoon.

And so it was not until the next day when we were able to even provide that plea agreement to Mr. Marcantoni because he had been taken from the courthouse by the marshals back to his house unit if you will. But he did -- he did enter into the plea. And there are factors there that we believe had we had the time to negotiate, would have been more favorable to him.

But that is not for today. Because that agreement

was executed and is before the Court and we stand by it. But I can tell the Court this, Mr. Marcantoni was released. He went on to supervised release and from the minute he went on, there was a problem. There was a personality conflict between him and Mr. Albert.

Now when the Government stands before you and I know Your Honor was a prosecutor, you have to rely upon the persons who provided you with the information. Whether it be agents, whether it be probation officers and I suggest that much of the presentation before the Court, be it this Court, Judge Titus', have been influenced by the conduct of Mr. Albert.

And I will stand before this Court and say that

Mr. Albert has been dishonest in the Court, he has been

dishonest to counsel and dishonest to Mr. Marcantoni. Now

Mr. Marcantoni was indicted in Baltimore County. And indeed he surrendered in Baltimore County, he was released. And he was advised by Mr. Albert that there would be a violation filed.

Of course there would be.

At that time, Mr. Marcantoni had secured the services of Andrew White, an attorney, in this city and I know the Court is familiar with him. And Mr. White and Mr. --- came into court to testify to this, Mr. White spoke to Mr. Albert and Mr. Albert agreed that Mr. Marcantoni would not be arrested, he could come into court ---.

However, in spite of that representation, Mr.

Marcantoni is arrested, he is brought into court and because of that, obviously the detention hearing has a different vein.

And from that day on, everything went down. And I will tell this Court, we went through hearing after hearing dealing with allegations that Mr. Marcantoni was violating electronic surveillance. Electronic monitoring. That became required because he had been indicted in Baltimore County and Mr. Albert was asking for that.

And we went on and on, violation after violation being noted. That he was away from his residence and he swore he wasn't. And we had witnesses that showed that he wasn't. It came time when the Court ordered that Mr. Stokes, Todd Stokes go out and check. And indeed Mr. Stokes found that the apparatus was indeed faulty. Was giving false reports.

But you see Mr. Albert wouldn't accept that. Now,
Mr. Albert is not on trial, Mr. Marcantoni is. But the
Government is standing before this Court and asking for
consecutive time and I am saying to this Court that there is
absolutely no reason why there should be any such action.
Mr. Marcantoni received the top of the guidelines and those
guidelines were calculated including an enhancement for being
on supervised release.

So he has been punished. It has been calculated, it has been included. I am not going to stand before this Court and say that Mr. Marcantoni did not commit an offense. He did.

And he has been punished for it. He has received a sentence.

And as the Court will hear in a moment from Mr. Levine, indeed
he has been punished more severely than anybody else in this
conspiracy.

But I know this, Mr. Marcantoni is a good man. And for the Government to stand here and say that he made millions, there is no such thing. For the Government to say that he didn't honor his commitments when required to report to submit income tax returns, he did everything.

This Court is stepping into the shoes of Judge

Davis. Nobody knows what Judge Davis ---. But I know that

when the Court looks at Anthony Marcantoni and looks at him

personally, looks at his accomplishments as we tried to point

out and realize that it was a stage he was placed on where one

is not seeing the true picture but is being shown a picture,

colored if you will, by bias then I suggest that this Court

will look and see this man's received 121 months incarceration.

And indeed for this type of offense, has indicated a purveyor

if you will of marijuana, that certainly is ---.

And that is why I stand before this Court and ask this Court in imposing any sentence, that it be concurrent with that of Judge Titus. And if I may, Your Honor, I would like to ask I --- by Mr. Levine.

MR. LEVINE: Thank you, Your Honor, good afternoon.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. LEVINE: Your Honor, at some point when it comes to the length of a prison sentence, we have to ask when is enough enough? And I know Your Honor has asked that question, the Government raised the fact that the guidelines indicate that it should -- a violation should run consecutive to a term of confinement for the actual offense.

I know Your Honor has disagreed in the past. In doing some research, I did come across the case of <u>United</u>

<u>States versus Randall Paul Schreve</u>, Your Honor handled the sentencing of that case for the substantive offense last year and then followed that with a violation hearing.

Your Honor gave Mr. Schreve the top of the guidelines for that. And immediately thereafter, there was a violation hearing and Your Honor sentenced Mr. Schreve to 24 months to run concurrent. So Your Honor recognized at that point in that case, that Mr. Schreve had gotten significant sentence, it was sufficient to send a message.

Like Mr. Schreve, Mr. Marcantoni received the top of the guidelines. That sentence of 121 months in a non-violent case, was far more than any one else who has thus far been sentenced who plead guilty in that conspiracy. I know Your Honor has read the papers and I won't go over each sentence that each co-defendant has received.

But Mr. Marcantoni faced a mandatory minimum sentence of 10 years because of the 851 enhancement. Because

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of his prior conviction. But for that enhancement, he would have been looking at 97 months to 121 months. But for the violation, which has already been taken into account, he would have been looking at a criminal history category less than he was looking at because that was factored into the guidelines calculation. So in effect, Mr. Marcantoni was facing and received a higher sentence because these factors were taken into account. As the Court knows from the submission, there is a lot of good in Mr. Marcantoni, in fact, we heard the same arguments today from the Government that Judge Titus heard at Mr. Marcantoni's sentencing. And although there was a little bit more at the sentencing, the Government criticized Mr. Marcantoni's efforts to start a martial arts studio. They suggested that the people he was keeping company with were not the type of people one should associate In fact, Mr. Cardin retrieved a poster yesterday which he saw on display in Baltimore City and it shows Mr. Marcantoni's business partner at --- which is a juhitsu Martial Arts studio and if I can just --(Pause.) MR. LEVINE: Your Honor, if I may approach? THE COURT: Yes.

MR. LEVINE: That is a poster of Mr. John

25 Ryland(sic) who helped run Ground Control and here is a news

release about this campaign, --- mayors, that is Baltimore City Mayor's anti-animal abuse advisory commission. "Show your soft side campaign aimed at changing the mind set of troubled teens who abuse animals in an attempt to appear, 'men'." So this is one of the people that Mr. Marcantoni associated himself with.

I would say that Mr. Marcantoni is a lot more than the marijuana conviction would suggest. He raised money for a widow and her young child. He started a business, a legitimate business which helped members of the community as reflected in the various letters.

Your Honor, the bottom line is that Mr. Marcantoni still has a great deal that he can contribute to society and unfortunately those contributions have been on hold. They have been on hold for a very long time. 121 months. We are simply the Court to recognize as this Court has recognized in other cases, that he has -- he is not getting away with anything.

His violation has been considered in the guideline range calculation. It was considered in the plea negotiation when counsel tried to get under the 121 months. But the fact that Mr. Marcantoni had done this before and was on supervised release, played a part in obtaining the plea that we received. The one that demanded mandatory minimum of 10 years and 8 years of supervised release.

Mr. Marcantoni is older now. He has been confined since he was arrested on this offense. He -- I don't hesitate

to say that I know Mr. Marcantoni has learned a lesson here. It can't imagine he will ever find himself in a courtroom again.

And we just have to say enough is enough when it comes to a lengthy prison sentence, Your Honor, there is no reason that a -- there is nothing that a consecutive sentence will do.

It will not suggest to the community that -- a concurrent sentence would not suggest to the community that Mr. Marcantoni has gotten away with something. The community has seen that he has been punished significantly for what he did, and for what he plead guilty for. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Marcantoni, please stand. In this case I find that revocation is appropriate and supervised release is revoked. This is perhaps my most hotly contested violation is supervised release. The violations alleged are serious and I have heard a good bit of discussion about the personality conflict between the probation agent and Mr. Marcantoni.

Of course the personality conflict does not excuse the subsequent criminal conduct which is where the additional punishment for the violation itself. Accordingly I find that a variance from the guidelines would be sufficient to reflect the seriousness of the offense and to deter comparable conduct, very limited aims (sic) of the sentence and that variance would be sufficient and not greater than necessary to again reflect seriousness of the violation and to deter comparable conduct.

Accordingly, Mr. Marcantoni, I commit you to the custody of the Attorney General as authorized designee of the Bureau of Prisons, serve a term of imprisonment of six months. That will be six months consecutive to the time that you were serving on Judge Titus' conviction. Do you understand the sentence? I do, Your Honor. THE DEFENDANT: THE COURT: You have 14 days from today's date to file an appeal. If you cannot afford to pay a filing fee, you can appeal without a fee, do you understand? THE DEFENDANT: I do. THE COURT: Thank you. Good day. MR. CARDIN: Thank you, Your Honor. (Whereupon, the hearing concluded.)

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

/s/ Lisa Contreras
Lisa Contreras
Certified Transcriber
Certificate No. CET**D-474

September 25, 2013 Date